

**Case Study on the Roman Catholic Church
English Benedictine Congregation
PART 1
Ampleforth and Downside**

**CTI Opening Statement for
Hearing commencing on 27 November 2017**

(1) Introduction

1. Chair, Members of the Panel. I appear today together with **Lois Williams** and **Jelia Sane**, junior counsel for this Case Study. **Ellen Shaw**, also junior counsel is not present today but will be joining us next week. We have also been assisted in preparation for this hearing by **Kate Beattie**.
2. May I introduce the legal representatives for the core participants present today:
 - **Iain O'Donnell** appears together with **Richard Scorer** on behalf of A43-A54, A64-A66, A69, A70, A72 and A75 and Jonathan West represented by Slater and Gordon solicitors
 - **Sam Stein QC** appears together with **David Enright** on behalf of F13 represented by Howe and Co solicitors
 - **Caolifhionn Gallagher QC** appears on behalf of D2, represented by Bhatia Best solicitors
 - **David Greenwood** on behalf of C18 and C19 represented by Switalskis solicitors
 - **Dominic Ruck Keene** on behalf of G1, G3, G4, and G6 and Whiteflowers Alba represented by Hugh James solicitors

- [Kate Ellis on behalf of G2 represented by Imran Khan and Partners solicitors - *may submit a written opening*]
- **Matthias Kelly QC** represents Ampleforth Abbey Trust
- **Kate Gallafent QC** represents both Downside Abbey, and the English Benedictine Congregation, and the Catholic Council for IICSA
- **Alan Payne** appears on behalf of North Yorkshire Police
- **Tania Griffiths QC** on behalf of Adrian Child and Eileen Shearer
- **Lord Alex Carlile QC** on behalf of Ealing Abbey and St Benedict’s School
- **Jonathan Dixey** on behalf of the Metropolitan Police Service
- **Cathryn McGahey QC** on behalf of the Secretary of State for Education.
- **Sarah McKimm and Claire Wigzell** on behalf of the Independent Schools Inspectorate
- **Jessica Simor QC and Zoe McCallum** on behalf of Ofsted

(2) **Case Study in Outline**

“Child abuse is a great evil. All abuse can leave scars on victims and their families. It is particularly abhorrent when people in a position of trust and responsibility abuse a child. It is more abhorrent when that position of trust is that of a member of the clergy or a lay church worker.”

So said Lord Nolan in his Review in 2001¹.

3. This is the first of the substantive public hearings in the Inquiry’s investigation concerning the **Roman Catholic Church**, which we anticipate will run for the next three weeks, and will conclude on the **15th of December**.

¹ Para 3.1.5 Nolan Report

4. The investigation into the **Roman Catholic Church** is wide ranging, and focuses broadly on **four** main themes:

- (i) **First** the prevalence of child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church.
- (ii) **Secondly**, the adequacy of the Catholic Church’s policies and practices in relation to safeguarding and child protection.
- (iii) **Thirdly**, the extent to which the culture of the Catholic Church has or does inhibit the proper investigation and prevention of child sexual abuse; and
- (iv) **Fourthly**, the adequacy of previous reviews of safeguarding arrangements, including but not limited to the Nolan Review and the Cumberlege Commission, including the extent to which the recommendations of those inquiries were implemented in policy and practice by the Catholic Church.

5. The hearing that we are about to embark upon is the first Part of the inquiry into the **English Benedictine Congregation**, which will seek to explore the extent to which the EBC has taken seriously its responsibility to safeguard children and to protect them from sexual abuse.

6. This hearing, Part 1, will focus on two institutions: **Ampleforth and Downside** and their associated schools. **Part 2**, to be heard at a later date, will examine Ealing Abbey and St. Benedict’s School (and possibly Worth Abbey and School)

(3) **Background / Overview**

7. There has, over the last 50 years or more, been a great deal of disclosure and reportage of sexual abuse alleged to have been committed by members of the English Benedictine Congregation and teachers at their associated educational institutions.
8. Those allegations that have been recorded go back many years, at least to the 1960's, and they continue into the present day. In considering the evidence and assessing the extent of abuse, it must be remembered that we have to rely on that which has been reported, and the extent and accuracy with which those reports have been recorded, if at all. In that time we have moved from scant records, little more than a handwritten notes on scraps of paper being kept, to electronic records. So some of the records that remain are old and illegible, some incomplete, some lost or destroyed.
9. Many of the people who kept the records and made the decisions about how allegations were dealt with are now deceased, or elderly and infirm. Some who made the allegations have passed away. Some who have been accused have long since died and so have escaped further investigation and, if appropriate, prosecution.

(4) Laws, Regulations and Guidance

10. A table setting out the History of Legislation and Guidance is in your bundles at A1. This is a working document, and additions may be made during the course of this hearing. But we must not forget that the lives of many have been forever blighted by the abuse they suffered at the hands of those they were meant to have been able to trust. It is understandable that many have been unable to move on, and that they continue to seek justice. And if not justice, at least explanation of how these things were allowed to happen, and assurance that every step will be taken to prevent them from happening again.

11. To that end, there have in the last 25 years been a number of investigations and Reviews into the into the arrangements for Child Protection and the prevention of abuse in the Catholic Church in England and Wales. *Amongst these are:*
12. In 1994, the Catholic Bishops' Conference received a working party report *Child Abuse: Pastoral and Procedural Guidelines*.
13. In 1996 another Church working party produced a report on Victims and Survivors *"Healing the Wound of Child Sexual Abuse"*
14. *Lord Nolan's First Report* was published at Easter 2001 for the Bishops' Conference that year contained 50 recommendations.
15. *Nolan's Final Report, "A Programme for Action"*, was published in September 2001 and amplified upon the first. Amongst the failures that were noted as prevalent within the Catholic Church were:
 - the failure to recognise the extent and prevalence of abuse;
 - the failure to scrutinise rigorously candidates for the priesthood;
 - the failures to communicate suspicions or even proof of misconduct; and
 - the failures to heed such communications when made;all of which, it was concluded, stemmed from an ignorance of the nature of paedophilia²
16. **The Final Report** contained 83 recommendations which were (at least in theory) largely and enthusiastically accepted by the Church.
17. Just briefly looking at the **first three of these**, it was recommended that:

² As summarised in para 2.7 Cumberlege

- I. The Catholic Church should be an example of the best practice in the prevention of child abuse and responding to it;
 - II. The top priority is to have preventative policies and practices operating effectively in parishes diocese and religious orders that will minimise the opportunity for abuse,
 - III. The whole Church in England and Wales, the individual bishops and religious superiors should commit themselves to a single set of policies, principles and practices based on the Paramountcy principle, (*which states that the welfare of the Child should be the paramount consideration in all decision making*) and the 13 principles of “*Safe from Harm*”, and the revised “*Working Together*”(a DfE publication) guidelines.
18. **Chair, members of the Panel**, you will need to consider how well these and the other recommendations have in fact been implemented in the 16 years since they were made.
19. **The Cumberledge Commission’s Review** was carried out in **2006-2007**, and its report, ***Safeguarding with Confidence***, was published in July 2007. That review concluded that 79 of Lord Nolan’s recommendations had been addressed, either completely, or partially³, but found that although progress had been made, the task was far from done, and the implementation process had been flawed and had exposed a number of deeply felt tensions within the Church and its associated organisations⁴.
20. It was observed that the successful implementation of child protection policies depended on engaging hearts and minds from the leadership down to grass roots, clergy and laity alike. And it seems to have been acknowledged that there was still some way

³ The four not addressed were Rec 40, 60, 80, and 82, which related to a national selection board for seminary candidates, development of whistleblowing policy, dealing with mistakes and learning from them, and developing a brief, user friendly parish leaflet.

⁴ Para 2.8 Cumberlege

to go in this regard, some religious leaders having argued that such policies had been only tolerated rather than embraced, some saying that they lacked any sound theological and spiritual context, and that the language they use is not that of the Church, one having said that such policies appeared “*foreign, bureaucratic, and even irrelevant*”⁵.

21. Of these comments the Report said this:

*“...there exists a misguided interpretation that sees [the unequivocal adoption of the paramouncy principle] as a means of protecting the Church and its leaders at the expense of the accused, especially where the accused is also a priest”*⁶.

22. It also observed that Religious congregations were a late addition to the diocesan led thinking and recommendations underpinning the Nolan review, and that 5 years on in 2007 they remained so. Because of the number and diversity of such congregations and communities, the “One Church” approach brought a particular challenge, and that although efforts had been made for the various Conferences to come together, there was not much visible evidence that the collaborative leadership had been sustained, and the uptake of the national policies among the religious was “*hugely variable*”, and in some instances “*slower and more grudging*”.

23. The Cumberlege Report stressed that success would depend on the Church at every level taking ownership of the safeguarding agenda, but described the will to do this as “patchy”, saying that in part this was a because of a growing confidence or complacency that the post-Nolan establishment of bodies to oversee safeguarding (COPCA - Catholic Office for the Prevention of Sexual Abuse of Children and Vulnerable Adults) were sufficient, and in part because of a lack of willingness to train and be trained.

⁵ Para 2.5 Cumberlege

⁶ Para 2.16 Cumberlege

24. Concerns were expressed that Bishops and Congregational leaders may be minimising the distressing consequences and the harmful anguish that follows in the wake of child abuse, and that the resistance to change, the fear and suspicion that the authority of the leadership was being undermined, had impeded the delivery of consistently good safeguarding arrangements⁷.
25. The Cumberlege Commission made 72 Recommendations, the **first** of which was that the Conference of Bishops and the Conference of Religious should publicly declare and renew their affirmation of the One Church approach to safeguarding.
26. **Chair, you and the members of the Panel** may wish to consider during the course of this hearing whether those comments were taken on board, and acted upon, and whether improvement has been made.

(4) **Ampleforth and Downside**

27. Returning to the two institutions upon which that this hearing will focus, **Ampleforth and Downside**. I will not summarise every **allegation here**. What we have been able to glean from the material disclosed, the reports made, and the records kept in respect of Ampleforth has been summarised into tables that appear in your Core Bundles at B5 and C1. These are working documents and may be amended as we proceed. Similar documents will be provided in respect of Downside in advance of next week.
28. Some of the perpetrators have been convicted and incarcerated. All here will have heard of the cases of **Piers Grant Ferris, David Lowe, and Dara De Cogan at Ampleforth, and Nicholas White and Desmond O’Keefe at Downside**. I am going to

⁷ Para 2.21 Cumberlege

briefly outline those cases, to give an overview of the matters that you will be considering.

29. Ampleforth had conducted an internal investigation into Fr. **Piers Grant Ferris in 1975 (number 5 of the Criminal Table, and 2 of the Safeguarding Table)**, following allegations having been made by a number of pupils. The abuse he had inflicted on boys over the years had in many instances begun with beatings, often for no reason at all, which would begin with smacking to the bare bottom, often progressing in severity, often with the child, sometimes as young as 7 or 8, made to get completely undressed and take up different poses. And rather than taking boys to Matron, he often undertook medical examinations of them, including taking their temperature, which he chose to do anally.
30. The investigation in 1975 was led by Fr Justin Caldwell, Fr Patrick Barry and Abbot Hume, all now deceased, who took it upon themselves to interview the pupils, and others, none of whom disclosed suffering or witnessing any abuse. Although at that stage PGF admitted pulling back foreskins of two boys⁸ he denied any sexual gratification, and it appear that Abbot Hume did not believe all the allegations⁹, and that he took great steps to ensure that PGF’s reputation remained intact. These concerns to preserve PGF’s good name may in part have been because of the Abbey’s association with his family, who it seems provided some financial support to the Abbey.
31. PGF was in the 70’s assessed by a Dr Spencer who found that he did pose a risk to children, this on the basis that he admitted to the Doctor that he did get some sexual gratification from spanking pupils. Abbot Hume conceded that he was unsuitable to continue working with children and PGF was removed from the school and transferred to Workington parish, where the parish priest was made aware of the issues. Further

⁸ A170 and A177

⁹ A152

allegations were made in 1995¹⁰, but in the then Abbot Patrick Barry's view, these were unfounded and/or malicious, a view that seems to have been shared by Dr. Spencer who briefly re-assessed PGF, and recommended that he be allowed to remain at Ampleforth.

32. The next Abbot, Timothy Wright, had post Nolan begun a working relationship with a psychologist, Dr. Elizabeth Mann. On her recommendation, in 2001 he commissioned her daughter, Dr. Ruth Mann also a psychologist, to carry out a further assessment. Ruth Mann profoundly disagreed with the previous findings of Dr. Spencer, and was firmly of the view that PGF was a danger to children. She expressed grave concern that PGF had not only been allowed to return to the monastery, but given work there in the Tuck Shop, together with another convicted abuser, Gregory Carroll (at number 10 of the Criminal table and 21 of the Safeguarding table). She asked that both be immediately removed. It is plain that Abbot Wright did not agree with Ruth Mann, and he sought a second opinion from Dr. Spencer, who had done the first assessment 20 years before, and who suggested that Ruth Mann must be wrong.

33. Many months passed, and the relationship between the Timothy Wright and Elizabeth and Ruth Mann deteriorated, as both psychologists pressed for removal of PGF. Their advice continued to be ignored, and finally they reported the matter. Police became involved, and **Operation Ellipse**, a police operation that set out to investigate allegations of child sexual abuse at Ampleforth was born. You will hear evidence about this later this week. But one of the matters of concern appears to have been that when police searched PGF's room, they found that he had possession of his own private file, which contained the Abbey's notes and records from the 1975 investigation, apparently given to him by Timothy Wright, in case the police came to the monastery with a warrant to search the Abbot's room.

¹⁰ A61

34. On 16 May 2005 PGF pleaded guilty to 21 counts of sexual assault. He was sentenced on the 26 January 2006 to two years imprisonment. You will be hearing from some of his victims during the evidence.

35. **David Lowe** (number 16 of the Criminal table) was convicted in Feb 2015 of a number of allegations dating back to the 1980's, committed both at Westminster Cathedral School, and Ampleforth, where he had gone on to teach after leaving his former post. Charged with 15 counts of indecent assault on a boys under 14 years of age in 2014 (relating to pupils both at Westminster Choir School and Ampleforth). He pleaded not guilty but was convicted by a jury on all counts and sentenced to 10 years imprisonment on 15 February 2015.

36. **Dara De Cogan**, (number 38 on the Criminal Table) who was a teacher at Ampleforth College, and who, on the pretext of tutoring a young female pupil late into the evening, groomed and sexually abused her between 2007-2010. The abuse took place on school premises, late at night in a school classroom, and in the grounds of the school. He would, during the day find opportunities to push her against a wall and insert his fingers into her vagina. He also tied her up, and masturbated over her, and there was oral and anal penetration. It seems that the abuse of the victim, A30, was wholly premeditated, as emails were found that went back to when she had just joined the school at the age of 13, in which he suggested that she had inappropriate feelings for him. This was a pre-emptive move that paved the way for the his abuse.

37. It was reported to the police in 04 /2016, and you will hear evidence from his victim, A30, who reported the matter as an adult in 2016. DdC pleaded G to 10 counts in February 2017 and was sentenced to 28 months imprisonment.

38. At **Downside** there was **Nicholas / Richard White**, against whom allegations were of sexual abuse committed in the 1980's, at least some of which had been disclosed to the Abbot at the time. But this was not reported to the police, by the Abbey, but there was media coverage in 1989 when the News of the World ran an exposure story. Nicholas White was sent off to a number of other monasteries, including in 1993 to Fort Augustus, where he remained until 1999 when he returned to Downside. Although there was some police enquiry, it was not until 2010 that matters were fully investigated when documentation in respect of the historical allegations was found at Downside, some of which had not previously been shared with the statutory authorities. Attempts to identify the victims followed, as did a prosecution, which resulted in convictions, for which he was sentenced in January 2012 to 5 years imprisonment. You will be hearing from one of his victims during the evidence.

39. Also **Desmond O'Keefe** who was convicted of a public order act offence in 2003. The facts of the offence were that he had been masturbating in a vehicle parked outside a primary school at going home time when children were leaving the school with their mothers. For this he received a conditional discharge. A year later he in 2004 he was convicted for offences arising out of his having collected child pornography, and in some instances superimposed the faces of children attending the school upon the indecent images. He was sentenced to 18 months imprisonment and was subsequently laicized in 2006.

40. The allegations made against individuals at both institutions demonstrate a wide spectrum of behaviour, spanning from:

- *excessive physical chastisement, sometimes apparently for sexual gratification;*

- *voyeuristic beatings where children had been made to strip, and to bend over so as to expose their naked bottoms for the sexual delectation of the person inflicting the punishment;*
- *grooming;*
- *fondling of genitalia;*
- *oral, anal and vaginal penetration;*
- *Buggery and Rape.*

41. During the course of this hearing you are likely to hear of occasions where it appears that:

- *Victims did not want to report allegations;*
- *Reports were ignored;*
- *steps were taken to apply pressure to families not to report allegations;*
- *Where families did not want reports to be made due to a perhaps misguided idea of what the child's best interests were;*
- *police were not informed or involved;*
- *known abusers were moved to another location apparently to appease parents or avoid scandal, but without appropriate safeguarding measures in place;*
- *abusers were allowed to remain in their posts;*
- *And some allowed to return to the Abbey, where they continued to have contact with children and other vulnerable individuals;*
- *Sometimes it being thought, rightly or wrongly, that greater control could be exerted over them there;*

42. It may be that there is some acceptance of failings, but reliance will be placed on changes that have been made over the years. But as you will hear, concerns remain and you are likely to hear evidence that suggests safeguarding problems are still ongoing, with the inevitable result that children may remain at risk.

(5) The Hearing Itself

43. The Scope for this hearing has been referred to in a number of the preliminary hearings, and has been published on the IICSA website¹¹ as a guide, in applying that Scope we will over the next three weeks introduce evidence on the following topics:

- An **overview** of the structure and organisation of the Roman Catholic Church in order to set the EBC in **context**, including an explanation of the central EBC, its structure and the Office of the Abbot President, and its relationship with its affiliated Abbeys and schools;
- The role of the **central bodies** within the EBC in England and Wales, particularly in respect of child protection, together with some relevant aspects of Canon law.
- The **duty of schools** in respect of safeguarding and child protection;
- The **nature and extent** of abuse at **Ampleforth and Downside** Abbeys and their associated schools;
- **the responses to such allegations** by the institutions, and relevant individuals within them;
- An overview of the **governance arrangements** at both institutions, and the safeguarding and child protection policies in place;
- The involvement of and liaison with the central EBC, and with other bodies including local authorities, police, and advisory bodies following allegations of abuse; and
- The manner in which those parties dealt with allegations and investigations into child sexual abuse.

44. During the course of the hearing evidence will be called from some of those who were Abbots, HeadMasters, and those involved in safeguarding at the institutions, including

¹¹ The scope of the Case Study on the English Benedictine Congregation is published. In summary it sets out to inquire into:

3.1.1. the nature and extent of child sexual abuse by individuals associated with the Congregation including, but not limited to, teachers in the Benedictine schools;

3.1.2. the nature and extent of any failures of the English Benedictine Congregation, the Catholic Church and/or other institutions or agencies to protect children from such abuse;

3.1.3. the adequacy of the response of the English Benedictine Congregation,, law enforcement agencies, prosecuting authorities and any other relevant institutions to allegations of child sexual abuse

3.1.4. the extent to which the English Benedictine Congregation sought to investigate, learn lessons, implement changes, and/or provide support and reparation to victims and survivors

3.1.5. the adequacy of child protection and safeguarding policy and practice across the English Benedictine Congregation during the relevant period, including the adequacy of any response to the recommendations of the Nolan and Cumberlege Commissions.”

some who carried risk assessments on the abusers. Also from police who investigated allegations, and others involved such representatives from the Catholic Church's safeguarding body COPCA, now CSAS, and the safeguarding coordinators from the relevant Dioceses.

(6) Procedural points

45. Turning now to some procedural matters.

46. You have before you bundles which provide you with Core material for the first chapter of this hearing which will deal with **Ampleforth**. The tables in your Bundle [B5 and C1] give some indication of what is known - and as you will see, there are multiple allegations that have been made against many individuals, in respect of many children.

47. Similar bundles will be provided to you in respect of Downside in due course, when we come to the evidence in respect of that institution in approximately a week and a half's time. Bundles will also be provided for each witness to be called.

48. Each counsel for the core participants will, in a moment, have an opportunity to make a short statement lasting no longer than 15 minutes. That will be followed by the evidence.

49. We have endeavoured to structure this in what we hope is a sensible and logical way, bearing in mind the amount of material there is, and the time that the offending behaviour spans. It perhaps goes without saying that we will not be able in this hearing to deal with every aspect of every allegation. Nor will we be able to answer every question. But we have sought to present evidence in a logical sequence, so far as is possible, and taking into account witness' availability.

50. It is anticipated that evidence will be adduced by calling witnesses live, the reading of statements edited or summarised by agreement, evidence being reduced into summary documents, and publishing that and other material on the IICSA website. This is to enable the Inquiry to consider in a proportionate way as broad a range of evidence as possible.
51. Some live complainant witnesses who are anonymous will have measures in place to protect their identities. Before an anonymous witnesses testifies, the hearing room will need to be cleared of press and members of the public, who will be able to listen to audio of the witness in a separate room. In respect of those witnesses to be called live, some may give their evidence over **video link** because the witness is too unwell or infirm to attend these proceedings. I shall invite the Chair and the Panel to rise while any arrangements are being made.
52. As anticipated by Rule 10 of the Inquiry Rules 2006 where witnesses give their evidence live, Inquiry Counsel will conduct the majority of the questioning of the witnesses. Core participants can apply to question witnesses under Rule 10. A number of applications have been received already and no doubt you will consider those and any further applications when received.
53. Where a witness' evidence is read, that witness has not been required to attend the hearing, and will not appear, but what they have said in their statements will be read into the public record. Some witness accounts are being read because the witness is too unwell to give live evidence. We have circulated proposals outlining what the evidence we intend to read and / or summarise, and any representations from the Core Participants are being taken into account.

(7) **Restriction Orders, redactions/ciphering and broadcasting**

54. Professional support is being made available for each witness who gives evidence as the Inquiry fully recognises how difficult a task this is.
55. There is a Restriction Order in place that protects the identities, names, addresses and images of any complainant Core Participants and any complainant victim. Some of the witnesses have specifically waived their right to anonymity, but for the remainder the Restriction Order must apply and so they will simply be referred to by their cipher as **A1, A2** etc.
56. Similarly, the material obtained for this Case Study has been redacted, and ciphers applied, where the Inquiry considers it appropriate, in accordance with the Inquiry's Protocol on the Redaction of Documents¹².
57. These proceedings will be broadcast. The broadcasting is subject to a 5 minute delay in case any issues over the Restriction Order, ciphering or redactions occur. We ask for the assistance of all concerned in respecting the processes in place and drawing to our attention promptly any issues that arise so that the broadcast can be terminated and the matter resolved. If such an issue arises I will say the following **“An issue has arisen as a result of which, Chair, I invite you to terminate the live broadcasting link and direct that there be no communication of the evidence given in the last 5 minutes”**. On resumption of the hearing I will invite the Chair to make a Restriction Order covering the evidence in question.
58. Abbot Yeo's will be the first live witness tomorrow after some reading. His evidence tomorrow will be confined to matters around the EBC which is to help us with understanding the context of the evidence to come. He will be recalled later in the

¹² https://www.iicsa.org.uk/key-documents/322/view/inquiry-protocol-on-redaction-of-documents_2.pdf

proceedings to be asked more specific questions about his roles as Abbot President, and Abbot of Downside Abbey, and any other matters arising out of the evidence including on on the EBC. Equally, a statement from Abbot Cuthbert Madden will be read tomorrow, to provide background and context, but he too will be called later to give live evidence about specific matters..

(8) Conclusion and Questions to consider

59. In conclusion, I would like to pose some questions that I suggest may arise during this hearing, that you Chair, and Members of the Panel, may wish to keep in mind during the course of the evidence that you will hear, will be read, and published:

- Was there a view that “these things just happen”?
- Was there a culture of “victim blaming”, a suggestion that because a child had not made formal complaint it was less serious than claimed;

- Was the first instinct to protect the perpetrator rather than to safeguard the child?
- To consider the perpetrator’s wellbeing over that of the child, the vulnerable?
- Were decisions taken with a view to the protection of the reputation of the Church over and above the safety of children?
- Were events deliberately hidden / covered up?
- Was the general attitude one of minimisation of allegations?
- Was pressure ever brought to bear on the parents and families of those who made complaint?
- Did the institutions ever accede to pressure from the families of monks accused?
- Is the suggestion that the response was one that was characterised as one of secrecy correct?

- Or, were people doing the best they could in the circumstances in which they found themselves?
- Were the efforts made to implement Nolan and to pay regard of Cumberlege adequate, or merely box ticking exercises, absent any real desire to implement change, and leading to a culture of complacency?
- Is there an entrenched belief that the clergy are superior to the laity and that their methods of safeguarding are better than those that have been recommended to them?
- Is rehabilitation within the religious community ever a suitable option, and if so under what conditions?

60. That concludes all I wish to say in opening, so I would invite you, Chair, now to hear Opening Statements from the Core Participants.

25 November 2017

**Riel Karmy-Jones QC
Lois Williams
Jelia Sane
Ellen Shaw**